

United States Patent and Trademark Office

de

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,686	06/30/2005	Evert Johannes Bunschoten	0470-045923	3094
7590 04/03/2007 Webb Ziesenheim Logsdon Orkin & Hanson 436 Seventh Avenue 700 Koppers Building			EXAMINER	
			CHUI, MEI PING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Pittsburgh, PA			1609	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
31 DAYS		04/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,686	BUNSCHOTEN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Helen Mei-Ping Chui	1609	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply but will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fute, cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th 3) Since this application is in condition for allow	nis action is non-final.	prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 18-33 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 18-33 are subject to restriction and/ 	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the specific properties are considered to by the second se	ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ection is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applic iority documents have been rece au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	eation No eived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 1609

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 18-33 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Groups I-XV, claim(s) 18-28 (in part), drawn to a method of treating or preventing an immune mediated disorder in a mammal, said method comprising the administration of a therapeutically effective amount of an estrogenic component; wherein the immune mediated disorder for Groups I-XV is as follows:

- 1) autoimmune diseases
- II) rheumatoid arthritis
- III) osteoarthritis
- IV) type 1 diabetes
- V) lupus
- VI) psoriasis
- VII) immune pathologies induced by infectious agents, including viral and bacterial agents.
- VIII) tuberculosis
- IX) leprosy
- X) transplant rejection
- XI) graft vs. host disease
- XII) atopic conditions
- XIII) eosinophilia
- XIV) conjunctivitis

And

Art Unit: 1609

XV) glomerular nephritis.

Group XVI, claim(s) 29-33, drawn to a pharmaceutical formulation comprising an estrogenic component and an oral unit dosage form of said formulation.

The inventions listed as Groups I-XVI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking Groups I-XVI is the estrogenic compound, estretrol. Dullien et al. teach estetrol (see WO 9603929A1, published on Feb 15, 1996, Page 3, line 15-19). Since the technical feature linking the inventions is known in the prior art, it does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Accordingly, inventions I-XVI are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species for the invention of Group XVI are as follows:

Pharmaceutical formulations comprising an estrogenic component and a specific immunotherapeutic agent selected from the group consisting of anti-

Application/Control Number: 10/517,686 Page 4

Art Unit: 1609

inflammatory agents; D-pencillamine; 4-aminoquinoline agents; azathioprine; methotrexate; cyclosporin; monoclonal antibodies to T lymphocytes, adhesion molecules ors to cytokines and growth factors; Tumor Necrosis Factor Receptor (TNFR)-IgG; IL-1 receptor antagonists; ICE inhibitors; betaferon; vitamin D; lot,25-dihydroxyvitamin D3 and lot,25-dihydroxyvitamin D2; agents that specifically bind a molecule selected from the group consisting of a T cell receptor, an antigen and a HLA molecule; organic gold derivatives such as a gold

If Applicant elects group XVI, then the Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

sodium thiomalate, aurothioglucose, or auranofin and an angiogenesis inhibitor.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Claims 19-31 and 33 and 32 (in part).

The following claim(s) are generic: 19-31 and 33.

Application/Control Number: 10/517,686

Art Unit: 1609

The species for the inventions of Groups I-XV are as follows:

Methods comprising administering estrogenic compounds represented by the formula that appears in claim 18; each species is an individual compound with R₁-R₇ defined.

If Applicant elects one of groups I-XV, then the Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 18 and 22-28.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the technical feature linking these formulations is the estrogenic component. As discussed above, this technical feature is not novel, and therefore does not

provide a contribution over the prior art. Therefore, it does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship

must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder Practice

The examiner has required restriction between process (invention I-XV) and product (invention XVI) claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issue. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should direct to Helen Mei-Ping Chui whose telephone number is 571-272-9078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30 am – 5:00 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-9078.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information Application/Control Number: 10/517,686

Art Unit: 1609

for published applications may be obtained from either PRIVATE PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through PRIVATE PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the PRIVATE PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 9